

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

5

Application Number	09/902,536
Filing Date	July 11, 2001
First Named Inventor	Albertsson et al.
Group Art Unit	3682
Examiner Name	C. Hansen

Attorney Docket Number

43315-214365

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	Response to Supplemental Examiner's Answer
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
	Remarks	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Venable P.O. Box 34385 Washington, D.C. 20043-9998	*26694* 26694 PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
Signature	Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134 	
Date	February 28, 2005	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450b on this date:

Typed or printed name

Signature

Date

VENABLE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, 22313-1450.

FEB 28 2005

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:

Albertsson et al. : Attorney Docket: 43315-214365
Application No.: 09/902,536 : Art Unit: 3682
Filed: July 11, 2001 : Examiner: C. Hansen

Title: MANIPULATOR

RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Supplemental Examiner's Answer issued December 29, 2004.

The present invention as recited in independent claim 11 differs structurally from the device suggested by Suzuki et al. For example, Suzuki et al. includes an arm 13 that does not rotate. On the other hand, the present invention as recited in claim 11 includes an upper arm that includes a front arm part and a rear arm part, wherein the front arm part is rotatable about a longitudinal axis.

Suzuki et al. is not properly combinable with Mauletti as suggested by the Examiner. For example, Suzuki et al. suggests a one piece arm 13 that does not rotate. As shown in the drawings and described in the specification, Suzuki et al. suggests a robot with five degrees of

freedom. On the other hand, Mauletti suggests a robot having six degrees of freedom. The two robots operate differently and have different associated problems. Modifying Suzuki et al. with Mauletti to provide a robot with six degrees of freedom would be contrary to the structure of Suzuki et al. The two structures provide different structures to achieve different degrees of mobility and operate differently.

Suzuki et al. suggests a structure that addresses problems associated with the robot having five degrees of freedom with a non rotating arm 13. On the other hand, the present invention as recited in claim 11, includes an upper arm that includes a front arm part and a rear arm part, wherein the front arm part is rotatable about a longitudinal axis. The supporting device recited in claim 11 includes a supporting arm mounted on the rear arm part and an auxiliary arm on the front part. The front arm part and the rear arm part are rotatable relative to each other. The present invention as recited in claim 11 provides a structure that eliminates or reduces problems arising with this structure.

As apparent from the above, real structural differences exist between the present invention as recited in independent claim 11 and the structures suggested by the cited references. As a result, the cited references do not suggest the present invention as recited in claim 11 or claims 2-6, which depend therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reversal of the rejections based on the cited references.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Date: 2/28/05

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202 344 4936
Facsimile: 202 344 8300